

So it was resolved in the affirmative.

On application of Mr. Beall, he was excused from voting on the question last stated.

Mr. M'Mahon then submitted the following order for consideration:

Ordered, That the governor and council be requested to report to this house forthwith, all their proceedings under the resolution of 1825, (not heretofore furnished,) authorising the recording of the unrecorded chancery papers, and also the cost of paper and stationary for completing said records, from whom, and by whom, purchased, and what commission, if any, was allowed on said purchase, to the person purchasing; and also whether the contracts entered into with them for the recording of the chancery papers under said resolution, extended to all the unrecorded papers in the office of the chancery court, or only to those which related to, or affected the title to real property, and are required to be recorded under the 5th section of the act of 1817, chap. 119; and also whether any contract to record the whole of said papers for a gross sum was offered to them; and if so, what were the terms of said contract, and by whom the same was or were offered.

Which being twice read, the question thereon was taken, Will the house adopt the said order? And it was resolved in the affirmative.

On motion by Mr. Boon, the bill reported by Mr. Peter, as chairman of the committee on divorces, entitled, An act for the relief of Temperance Hudson, of Kent county, was taken up for consideration, read the second time, passed without amendment, and sent to the senate for concurrence.

Mr. M'Mahon then submitted the following order for consideration:

Ordered, That the governor be requested to report to this house forthwith, whether under any act or acts of assembly, relative to the erection of state tobacco warehouses, any person or persons have been appointed by them to superintend the building of said warehouses; and if so, what is the tenure of the office of such superintendant, and the duties of his office? What the security required of him for the faithful performance of those duties? And whether public notice was given of their intention to create such an office, and of their desire to receive proposals on the best possible terms for the employment of such superintendant? And also whether any officer has been appointed by them to collect and receive wharfage on any of the state's property, within the city of Baltimore, what the extent of wharfage authorised to be received by such officer? Whether he is a salary officer, or is paid out of the proceeds of the wharfage received by him? And if so, what is the proportion of the wharfage allotted to him? What security has been required of him, for the per-